

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/870,939	AMORESE ET AL.	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** Under Appeal

(1) BJ Forman.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Diane Reese.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 16 May 2005

**Time:** 1:00

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*all*

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

*Bao*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

*BJ FORMAN, PH.D.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER*

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted Ms. Reese (via voice mail) to discuss possible amendments to overcome the Bao reference. The suggested language included defining the "second features" such that all the second features on the array containing the same molecule as described in the specification (page 15, last paragraph). The examiner stated that, discussion during the appeal conference determined that the Bao reference was a very strong reference. Given the discussions of the appeal conference, the examiner requested the opportunity to discuss possible amendments to thereby expedite prosecution. On May 17<sup>th</sup>, Ms Reese left a voice mail message for the examiner stating that Applicant feels the claims, as is, are allowable over the prior art and requested the case go forward to the Board.

*W*  
R. FORMAN, PH.D.  
EXAMINER